

To this question, Mr. Marceca simply responded: "That's correct."¹⁵⁶

e. Mr. Marceca's Testimony at the June 26, 1996 House Committee Hearing.

On June 26, 1996, at the House Committee hearing, Mr. Marceca expressly stated without limitation in his opening statement that he had read the reports for content when they arrived at the OPS, although his main focus was to determine the date of the most recent background report:

When the previous reports came into the office, I pulled the file I had created for the individual and reviewed the report to determine the date for the individual's next periodic reinvestigation and to determine whether there was any information in the individual's previous report that could raise a question as to the individual's suitability to have access to the White House complex. In almost every case, my basic function was to determine from the previous reports whether a new investigation was needed. If the previous report showed that a background investigation had been done within the last 5 years, I marked on the label on the file the date when a new investigation would be needed and I put the folder into the general file. If the previous report showed that a background investigation had not been done in the last 5 years, I began the task of putting together a proper file to initiate the reinvestigation process.¹⁵⁷

The underlined statements in the above excerpt represent an unequivocal assertion that he reviewed every report for

¹⁵⁶ This is the most significant response, because it is not qualified as to time (e.g., after a new SF-86 was returned) or as to the level of review (e.g., "in depth").

¹⁵⁷ HCGRO 6/26/96 Hearing at 39 (Marceca) (emphasis supplied).